DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMINED Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	APR - 4 2000 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Inquiry Concerning Deployment of)	- CONETARY
Advanced Telecommunications)	
Capability to All Americans in a Reasonable)	
And Timely Fashion, and Possible Steps)	CC Docket No. 98-146
To Accelerate Such Deployment Pursuant)	
To Section 706 of the Telecommunications)	
Act of 1996	Ì	

REPLY COMMENTS OF BELLSOUTH CORPORATION

BellSouth Corporation, for itself and its affiliated companies (collectively "BellSouth"), submits the following reply comments in response to the *Notice of Inquiry* ("*NOI*") released in the above-captioned proceeding.¹

I. Introduction

The majority of those filing comments in this proceeding are in agreement that advanced telecommunications capabilities are being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely manner. Accordingly, almost all of the commenters believe that no regulatory initiative is necessary on the Commission's part to speed the deployment process. Instead, many of the commenters advocate modification of existing rules that have already been decided or are under review in other Commission proceedings.

No. of Copies rec'd 074 List ABCDE

In the Matter of Inquiry Concerning Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications
Capability to All Americans in a Reasonable And Timely Fashion, and Possible Steps To
Accelerate Such Deployment Pursuant To Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
CC Docket No. 98-146, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 00-57 (rel. Feb. 18, 2000) ("NOI").

As stated in its comments, BellSouth agrees that deployment of advanced telecommunications capability is occurring in a reasonable and timely manner. Those comments express a strong belief that the Commission should work to create a more competitive environment among all advanced service providers instead of placing restrictive regulation on only one set of those providers – incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs"). As the Commission stated in the *UNE Remand Order*:

Our decision to decline to unbundle packet switching therefore reflects our concern that we not stifle burgeoning competition in the advanced services market. We are mindful that, in such a dynamic and evolving market, regulatory restraint on our part may be the most prudent course of action in order to further the Act's goal of encouraging facilities-based investment and innovation.²

The Commission has already recognized that no one class of providers controls the advanced services market. All who enter the market do so as new participants. For that reason, the Commission should strive to allow all participants to compete within a neutral regulatory setting. There is no reason to continue to treat cable modem providers differently from ILECs or CLECs in the provision of advanced services. To do so only creates unearned competitive advantages for the class of providers that already leads in market penetration and is projected to increase that lead in the future.³

See In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket 96-98, Third Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 99-238 (rel. Nov. 5 1999) ("UNE Remand Order").

See Press Release, Home Cable and DSL Internet Connections to Explode, Computer Economics [online], March 13, 2000, http://www.computereconomics.com/new4/pr/2000/pr000313.html.

II. Regulatory Parity Will Allow a Strong Competitive Market

In its comments, BellSouth pointed out the disparity that exists between Commission treatment of ILECs and cable modem providers. That disparity exists even though both face the same market conditions. BellSouth made this comparison not to argue that cable modem providers should be regulated like ILECs. To the contrary, BellSouth's point is that in a new market, with no dominant service providers, imposing excessive regulation on one class of entrants while allowing others to operate virtually unfettered will not lead to real competition. While ILECs are mired in regulation, cable modem providers operate freely in a fast paced competitive market. This slows the ILECs' speed of offerings and impedes their competitiveness. For robust competition to flourish, the Commission should forbear from regulating all advanced telecommunications service providers.

Not surprisingly, AT&T, as a cable modem provider, argues that the Commission should maintain disparate treatment for ILECs and other providers. AT&T has two goals: first, to avoid regulation of itself, and second, to maintain continued regulation of the ILECs. Thus, AT&T argues that ILECs need to be regulated while cable modem providers do not because cable modem providers are new to the market and have few customers. Its rationale for non-regulation, however, is equally applicable to ILECs. ILECs too are new to the market and no one has a dominant share of the market. AT&T seems to think that voice customers for an ILEC translate to customers for advanced services. Having voice service, or dial up Internet service for that matter, offers no advantages to a customer seeking broadband services, however. Under this logic, having a television customer for a cable provider would be just as advantageous for a

BellSouth does not contend that the Commission should forbear from unbundling obligations for underlying facilities, such as the local loop, used to provide advanced services, but should forbear regulation of those facilities used exclusively for advanced services.

cable modem provider seeking to provide advanced services. Indeed, AT&T cannot seriously suggest on the one hand that the existing customer base for ILECs affords a competitive advantage as advanced services providers, but on the other hand contend that the existing customer base of cable companies does not offer comparable benefits.

Second, AT&T contends that regulatory disparity between ILECs and cable modem providers should continue because cable modem service is provided over a shared network while DSL service is offered over a dedicated facility. AT&T argues that saddling cable modem providers with the same regulatory obligations as ILECs bear would therefore be inappropriate. BellSouth, however, does not believe that parity should be accomplished by placing ILEC regulatory obligations on cable modem providers. Instead, parity should be accomplished by removing such obligations from ILECs providing advanced services. The Commission has repeatedly stated that its job is not to pick winners or losers in technology but to maintain a level playing field. The fact that each technology has certain advantages and disadvantages provides no basis for the Commission to impose disparate regulation on competing providers of advanced services.

Finally, AT&T argues that different regulatory schemes are justified because of the risk assumed by cable modem providers in developing that service as compared to the development of DSL service. AT&T would have the Commission believe that ILECs face no risk of investment because they deployed their basic infrastructure for DSL while allegedly being shielded from competition. Moreover, AT&T asserts that ILECs incurred no research and development cost for DSL because it was developed by Bell Labs in the 1980s. This is simply another AT&T red herring. AT&T is well aware that the basic infrastructure for providing DSL in the form of loops and other network elements is currently available to any CLEC at cost-based

prices as required by the Commission's rules. Such prices do not include historical costs but are

forward-looking. Additionally, BellSouth is deploying new infrastructure today in the form of

digital subscriber line access mutilplexers ("DSLAMs") and ATM switches for the provision of

advanced services to its customers. Thus, AT&T's suggestion that ILECs are shielded from

investment risks to the disadvantage of other competitors is patently without merit.

The claim that ILECs do not incur research and development costs is equally frivolous.

The initial development of DSL done by Bell Labs was only the beginning. Development is a

very dynamic process. To suggest that development occurred as a one time stagnate event is

nonsensical. BellSouth, as well as other ILECs, CLECs, and vendors of DSL equipment⁵ have

invested heavily to bring DSL to a stage that it can be deployed on a mass-market basis. To

suggest that ILECs have been free of research and development cost in the deployment of DSL is

unrealistic and disingenuous.

AT&T and the ILECs are competing in the same market for the same customers. Every

dollar of unnecessary regulatory costs that AT&T can convince this Commission to impose on

the ILECs is a dollar of unearned competitive advantage that AT&T can exploit in the

marketplace. The consumer benefits of a competitive market will only be realized if all

technologies are allowed to compete for new customers with new services on an equal footing.

III. **Issues Decided or Currently Under Review in Other Proceedings**

Some commenters request that the Commission decide issues that are currently pending

in other proceedings or issues that have been resolved previously by the Commission. NewPath

encourages the Commission "to revisit on its own authority its decision to not adopt specific

Of course the purchasers of this equipment – ILECs and CLECs – bear the burden of

vendor development.

BellSouth Reply Comments CC Docket No. 98-146

Doc. No. 121772

5

provisioning time intervals for collocation." Other commenters make suggestions regarding collocation as well. This docket is not the proper forum to address these requests. Collocation is currently being addressed in other open proceedings. For example, the Commission established new collocation rules in its First Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147 ("Collocation Order"). Sprint filed a Petition for Reconsideration of the Collocation Order, which specifically asks the Commission to reconsider its interval ruling. Accordingly, any decision made by the Commission regarding collocation intervals should be pursuant to the record in the Collocation Order proceeding.

Moreover, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit recently issued an opinion that vacated some of the rules adopted by the Commission in the *Collocation Order*. Consequently, the Commission will need to conduct further proceedings in response to the Court's opinion. The Commission should address any matters related to collocation in other proceedings. The record in the current proceeding is woefully inadequate to reach any such issues.

On pages 38 through 45 of its comments, AT&T essentially restates its Petition for Reconsideration to the Commission's *Third Report and Order* in CC Docket No. 98-147 ("*Line Sharing Order*"). AT&T asserts that the Commission should reverse the plain language of the

⁶ Comments of NewPath at 6.

⁷ See Comments of Sprint at 6 and Jato Communications Corp. at 10 –11.

In the Matters of Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147, First Report and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 4761 (1999) ("Collocation Order").

In the Matters of Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 and 96-98, Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147 and Fourth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 99-355, released December 9, 1999 ("Line Sharing Order").

Line Sharing Order and require ILECs to provision line sharing even when the ILEC is not the voice provider. AT&T makes this claim even though the Commission fully considered and rejected its position in the Line Sharing Order. In its Opposition to AT&T's Petition for Reconsideration, BellSouth has already provided extensive analysis of the deficiencies in AT&T's position. BellSouth attaches its Opposition as Exhibit 1. The Commission should address AT&T's repetitive comments in response to the Petition for Reconsideration of the Line

IV. Conclusion

Sharing Order.

The comments in this proceeding clearly support the conclusion that advanced services are being provided on a reasonable and timely basis. Accordingly, no major new regulatory initiative is needed by the Commission to stimulate deployment. Instead, the Commission should continue to pursue policies that will stimulate rapid growth in advanced telecommunications capabilities. Such polices will be best achieved by competition in the market and not past regulatory models. In its comments, BellSouth has suggested proposals that the Commission should undertake in existing proceedings to better achieve competition and

rapid growth in the advanced services market. The Commission should implement these proposals to promote true competition.

Respectfully submitted,

BELLSOUTH CORPORATION

futhuland

By its Attorneys

M. Robert Sutherland Stephen L. Earnest

Suite 1700 1155 Peachtree Street, N. E. Atlanta, Georgia 30306-3610 (404) 249-2608

Date: April 4, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that I have this 4th day of April, 2000, served the following parties to this action with a copy of the foregoing *REPLY COMMENTS OF BELLSOUTH*CORPORATION, reference CC Docket No. 98-146, by hand delivery or by placing a true and correct copy of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the parties as set forth on the attached service list.

Lenora Riera-Lewis

Certificate of Service CC Docket No. 98-146 Doc. No. 121772

Service List CC Docket No. 98-146

Magalie Roman Salas, Commission Secretary*
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
TW B-204
Washington, DC 20554

International Transcription Service, Inc.* 445 12th Street, SW CY-B402 Washington, DC 20054

Larry Goldberg, Director Media Access WGBH Educational Foundation 125 Western Avenue Boston, MA 02134 David W. Owen James J. Gunther, Jr. Alcatel USA, Inc. 1909 K Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20006

Teresa K. Gaugler Jonathan Askin Association for Local Telecommunications Services 888 17th Street, NW, Suite 900 Washington, DC 20006 Guy Christiansen Director, Regulatory Affairs SkyBridge LP 3 Bethesda Metro Center Suite 700 Bethesda, MD 20814

Ben Wiles, Senior Attorney Gerald A. Norlander, Executive Director Public Utility Law Project 90 State Street, Suite 601 Albany, NY 12207 Donald Vial Chairman, Public Policy Committee Alliance for Public Technology 919 19th Street, NW, 9th Floor Washington, DC 20006 Emily Sheketoff, Executive Director Washington Office, American Library Association 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 403 Washington, DC 20004

Mark C. Rosenblum, Stephen C. Garavito, Teresa Marrero AT&T Corp. Room 1131M1 295 North Maple Avenue

Douglas Garrett AT&T Broadband 9197 S. Peoria Street Englewood, CO 80112

Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Donna Epps Bell Atlantic 1320 North Court House Road Eighth Floor Arlington, VA 22201 Howard J. Symons, Tara M. Corvo, Michaelle Mundt, & Ghita Harris-Newton Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky & Popeo, PC 701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 900 Washington, DC 20004

Of Counsel for AT&T Corp.

Douglas I. Brandon AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. 1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

Michael E. Glover Bell Atlantic 1320 North Court House Road Eighth Floor Arlington, VA 22201

Of Counsel for Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies

Richard M. Tettelbaum John B. Adams Suite 500, 1400 16th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Attorneys for Citizens Utilities Company

Ronald L. Plesser, Stuart P. Ingis, & Stuart P. Ingis Piper & Marbury LLP Seventh Floor 1200 Nineteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Attorneys for Commercial Internet Exchange Association

David A. Nall Benigno E. Bartolome Squire, Sanders & Dempsey LLP 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW PO Box 407 Washington, DC 20044

Of Counsel for Consumer Electronics Association

Barbara S. Esbin & Laura S. Roecklein Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC 1200 New Hampshire Avenue, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Attorneys for Cox Communications, Inc.

Gail L. Polivy GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, NW Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20036 Thomas K. Crowe C. Jeffrey Tibbels Law Offices of Thomas K. Crowe, PC 2300 M Street, NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20037

Counsel for the Commonwealth of The Northern Mariana Islands

Consumer Electronics Association Michael Petricone, VP Technology Policy Gary S. Klein, VP Gov. & Legal Affairs Ralph Justus, VP Technology & Standards 2500 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22201

George N. Barclay, Associate General Counsel, Personal Property Division Michael J. Ettner, Senior Assistant General Counsel Personal Property Division General Services Administration 1800 F Street, NW, Room 4002 Washington, DC 20405

Jeffrey S. Linder Joshua S. Turner Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006 Thomas R. Parker GTE Service Corporation 600 Hidden Ridge, MS HQ-E03J43 PO Box 152092 Irving, TX 75015-2092

Mike McCurry, Co-chair Susan Molinari, Co-chair iAdvance 919 18th Street, NW 9th Floor Washington, DC 20006

MediaOne Group, Inc.
Susan M.Eid, VP, Federal Relations
Marbara A. Sofio, VP - Law
Tina S. Pyle, Executive Director for Public Policy
Cameron R. Graham, Associate General Counsel
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 610
Washington, DC 20006

Henry Rivera, Larry Solomon, J. Thomas Nolan, & Tamara Y. Brown Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 600 14th Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005-2004

Counsel for Metricom, Inc.

Gary M. Epstein, John P. Janka Arthur S. Landerholm, & Lee Ann Bambach Latham & Watkins 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 1300 Washington, DC 20004

Attorneys for Hughes Network Systems Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc.

Steven Augustino Jennifer M. Kashatus Kelley Drye & Warren LLP 1200 19th Street, NW Suite 500 Washington, DC 20036

Attorneys for JATO Communications Corp.

Richard S. Whitt, Alan Buzacott & Kecia Boney Lewis MCI Worldcom, Inc. 1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20006

Daniel L. Brenner, Neal M. Goldberg, & Michael S. Schooler 1724 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

Counsel for the National Cable Television Assocation Gregory L. Klein Sr. Director, Economic & Policy Analysis The National Cable Television Association 1724 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

Joe A. Douglas Senior Regulatory Manager National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. 80 South Jefferson Road Whippany, NJ 07981

L. Marie Guillory Daniel Mitchell 4121 Wilson Boulevard 10th Floor Arlington, VA 22203-1801

Attorneys for National Telephone Cooperative Association

Lawrence R. Freedman S. Jenell Trigg Fleischman and Walsh, LLP 1400 Sixteen Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Counsel for Newpath Holdings, Inc.

Richard A. Askoff Regina McNeil 80 South Jefferson Road Whippany, NJ 07981

Attorneys for National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.

Margot Smiley Humphrey Koteen & Naftalin, LLP 1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-4104

Attorneys for National Rural Telecom Association

Rodney L. Joyce Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 600 14th Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005-2004

Attorneys for Network Access Solutions Corporation

Stephen L. Goodman Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Maher 555 12th Street, NW Suite 950, North Tower Washington, DC 20004

Counsel for Nortel Networks Corporation

John G. Lamb, Jr. Nortel Networks Corporation 2100 Lakeside Boulevard Richardson, TX 75081-1599

Of Counsel

Michael Olsen Deputy General Counsel NorthPoint Communications, Inc. 303 Second Street, South Tower San Francisco, CA 94107

David D. Oxenford, Bruce D. Jacobs, & Stephen J. Berman Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader & Zaragoza LLP Suite 400 2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20006

Attorneys for Pegasus Communications Corp.

Rikke Davis Jay C. Keithley 401 9th Street, NW 4th Floor Washington, DC 20004

Attorneys for Sprint Corporation

Ruth Milkman Valerie Yates Lawler, Metzger & Milkman, LLC 1909 K Street NW Suite 280 Washington, DC 20006

OPASTCO
Stuart Polikoff, Director of Government Relations
Stephen Pastorkovich, Senior Policy Analyst
21 Dupont Circle NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Prism Communications Services, Inc.
Randall B. Lowe, Chief Legal Officer
Julie A. Kaminski, Deputy Chief Counsel –
Telecommunications
1667 K Street NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006

Vincent C. Degarlais Suite 700 1020 19th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Attorneys for US West Communications, Inc.

Dan L. Poole Suite 700 1020 19th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Of Counsel for US West Communications, Inc.

Jeffrey L. Sheldon Brett Kilbourne United Telecom Council 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 1140 Washington, DC 20036

Lynda L. Door Secretary to the Commission Public Service Commissin of Wisconsin 610 North Whitney Way PO Box 7854 Madison, WI 53707-7854 Lawrence E. Sarjeant, Linda L. Kent, Keith Townsend, John W. Hunter & Julie E. Rones 1401 H Street, NW Suite 600 Washington, DC 20005

Attorneys for United States Telecom Association

Paul J. Sinderbrand Robert D. Primosch Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP 2300 N Street, NW Suite 700 Washington, DC 20037-1128

Attorneys for The Wireless Communications Association International, Inc.

TATE STAMP

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

	to the state of th
In the Matter of) AND RETURN
)
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering) CC Docket No. 98-147
Advanced Telecommunications Capability	
and	~ (C _C ,
and	MAR MAR
Implementation of the Local Competition) CC Docket No. 96498 22
Provisions of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)
)
)

BELLSOUTH'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION

BELLSOUTH CORPORATION

M. Robert Sutherland Stephen L. Earnest

Its Attorneys
Suite 1700
1155 Peachtree Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30306-3610
(404) 249-2608

Date: March 22, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Summary	. 1
II.	The Line Sharing Order Needs No Clarification	. 3
A	A. ILECs' Obligation for Line Sharing	. 4
E	3. ILECs' Obligations for Line Sharing when a CLEC is the Voice Carrier under UNE-P	
C	C. Voluntary Agreements between CLECs to Share a Loop	8
D	2. AT&T's Request to Force ILECs to Provide ADSL	9
III.	The Commission should Deny Petitioners Claims for Reconsideration 1	1
IV.	Conclusion	2

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability) CC Docket No. 98-147
and)
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996) CC Docket No. 96-98
	<i>)</i> }

BELLSOUTH'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION

I. Introduction and Summary

BellSouth Corporation, on behalf of its affiliated companies through undersigned counsel ("BellSouth"), and pursuant to Section 1.429(f) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.429(f), files its Opposition to the Petition of AT&T Corp. for Expedited Clarification or, In the Alternative, for Reconsideration ("AT&T Petition") and Petition for Clarification of MCI WorldCom ("MCI Petition") filed in the above captioned proceeding.²

BellSouth Corporation is a publicly traded Georgia corporation that holds the stock of companies which offer local telephone service, provide advertising and publishing services, market and maintain stand-alone and fully integrated communications systems, and provide mobile communications and other network services worldwide. BellSouth participated in all aspects of the pleading cycle in this rulemaking proceeding.

In the Matter of Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147 and Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 98-47 and Fourth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 99-355, released December 9, 1999 ("Line Sharing Order" or "Order").

Both MCI and AT&T ask the Commission for clarification, or in the alternative reconsideration, on whether an incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") must provide the elements that will allow a competitive local exchange carrier ("CLEC") providing voice service to a customer, to line share with another CLEC providing data service to the same customer. Under the scenario described by AT&T and MCI (sometimes referred to as "Petitioners"), the ILEC would be providing no service to the customer. Although MCI and AT&T have both labeled their petitions as primarily seeking clarification, the issue presented is not one open to interpretation. The Commission could not have been clearer in defining the ILEC's unbundling obligations for line sharing. One only need read the Line Sharing Order's Executive Summary to understand these obligations. There the Commission unequivocally states that, "[i]ncumbent LECs must provide unbundled access to the high frequency portion of the loop to only a single requesting carrier, for use at the same customer address as the analog voice service provided by the incumbent. Incumbents are not required to provide unbundled access to the high frequency portion of the loop if they are not currently providing analog voice service to the customer."³ After reading these statements BellSouth must question why exactly MCI and AT&T need clarification.

MCI and AT&T both ignore the plain language of the *Line Sharing Order*. Based on the plain language, the Commission should summarily dismiss Petitioners requests for clarification. Their requests for reconsideration should be dismissed as well. The Commission examined the issue raised in their petitions thoroughly in the *Line Sharing Order* and found that no impairment exists when an ILEC is not providing the voice service. Accordingly, pursuant to statute, the

³ Line Sharing Order at 6 (emphasis added).

Commission cannot require the unbundling of a network element where the Commission has found no impairment.

II. The Line Sharing Order Needs No Clarification

The petitions struggle to extract a meaning from the words of the *Line Sharing Order* different from what the *Order* made unmistakably obvious. The *Line Sharing Order* specifically states "[t]he provision of xDSL-based service by a competitive LEC and voiceband service by an incumbent LEC on the same loop is frequently called 'line sharing.'" Thus, by definition, the *Line Sharing Order* clearly contemplated and mandated line sharing obligations *only* in those situations in which the ILEC provides the voice service to the customer.

Petitioners present a situation not addressed in the *Line Sharing Order* – two carriers providing services over the same loop when the ILEC is not the voice service provider. While this situation may be line sharing in the technical sense, it does not trigger the ILEC obligations established in the *Line Sharing Order*. Indeed, the Commission went out of its way to limit such obligations to only those situations where the ILEC provides the voice service. BellSouth does not dispute that under certain circumstances two CLECs may, on a voluntary basis, provide separate services to the same customer over the same loop. Throughout the line sharing proceeding BellSouth and other ILECs noted that CLECs could obtain from ILECs necessary network elements and combine them to provide multiple services to end user customers. The Commission acknowledged this point stating "that self-provisioning a circuit-switched network is not the sole means of providing voice service. In particular, requesting carriers could obtain combinations of network elements and use those elements to provide circuit-switched voice

Line Sharing Order ¶ 4.

⁵ See Section II.A below.

service as well data services." In explaining its position the Commission then stated "[i]n this scenario, a requesting carrier would essentially share the line with itself by attaching a splitter to the loop at a technically feasible point and separating the voiceband from the high frequency portion of the loop to provide both voice and xDSL services." Thus, the Commission recognized that the CLEC would have to install the splitter in order to combine the elements to provide voice and data services.

In that situation, however, the ILEC should not be involved – it has nothing to share.

This is strictly an arrangement between the two CLECs. The Commission did not leave the ILEC's obligations in such situation open for question.

A. ILECs' Obligation for Line Sharing

The Commission carefully delineated the parameters governing when an ILEC must provision line sharing, including line sharing capabilities:⁸

[The Commission] require[s] incumbent LECs to provide access to this network element to a single requesting carrier, on loops that carry the incumbent's traditional [plain old telephone service ("POTS")], to the extent that the xDSL technology deployed by the competitive LEC does not interfere with the analog voiceband transmissions.... The record does not support extending line sharing requirements to loops that do not meet the prerequisite condition that an incumbent LEC be providing voiceband service on that loop for a competitive LEC to obtain access to the high frequency portion.

BellSouth finds a common theme runs through these statements, a theme that MCI and AT&T have missed – line sharing requirements, including access to the high frequency portion of the loop, arise only when the ILEC is providing the voice service.

⁶ Line Sharing Order ¶ 47.

⁷ *Id.* ¶ 47 n. 95 (emphasis added).

See Line Sharing Order, Section IV.D.1., Parameters for Line Sharing Deployment.

⁹ *Id.* ¶ 70, 72 (emphasis added).

MCI states in its petition that "the Commission should clarify that ILECs must take all necessary steps to allow UNE-P CLECs to self-provision or partner with facilities-based data CLECs to provide voice and data service to the same customer." In essence, MCI's request is that ILECs should take all necessary steps to allow two CLECs to provide services over the same loop, *i.e.*, all of the obligations that the ILEC has under the *Line Sharing Order*, when the ILEC does not provide any service to the customer. Indeed, the petition goes on to state that "the ILECs should provide CLECs with the same functions they already perform in support of ILEC line sharing." MCI defines these functions as the ILEC's provisioning and connecting the splitter, performing all cross-connects between the two CLECs' equipment and the ILEC's equipment, if necessary, all Operations Support Systems ("OSS"), trouble-reporting, and trouble-shooting functions.

MCI's interpretation reads the requirement that limits "access to this network element to a single requesting carrier, on loops that carry the incumbent's traditional POTS" out of the Line Sharing Order. The Order limits not merely the "use" of the high frequency spectrum, but also "access to" the high frequency spectrum, to loops that carry ILEC POTS. BellSouth asks what "access" could possibly mean if not the equipment to provide line sharing, such as the splitter and cross connects. The Commission reemphasized the limitation on access when it said that it was not extending "line sharing requirements to loops that do not meet the prerequisite condition that an incumbent LEC be providing voiceband service on that loop for a competitive

MCI Petition at 4.

¹¹ *Id.* at 6.

See infra fn. 19.

MCI Petition at 6.

LEC to obtain *access* to the high frequency portion."¹⁴ Requirements for a CLEC to obtain access to the high frequency portion of the loop obviously include provisioning. Moreover, it is axiomatic that if there is no requirement to provide access to a network element, then there is no requirement to provide any associated unbundled OSS and trouble maintenance.¹⁵

Not only did the Commission clearly limit ILECs' line sharing obligations only to those situations when the ILEC is the voice service provider, but did so based on the fact that any impairment a CLEC may experience from not having access to the high frequency spectrum on the loop only exists when the ILEC is the voice provider. The Commission stated unequivocally that "we do not find impairment where the incumbent LEC is not providing voice service on the customer's loop, or where the competitive LEC is seeking to deploy a form of xDSL that is not compatible with voice service provided on a shared line." ¹⁶

Both AT&T and MCI are well aware of the requirements set forth in section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act") and the Supreme Court decision interpreting the statute in AT&T v. Iowa Utilities Board, 525 U.S. 366 (1999). In particular, a requirement to unbundle an element may be imposed only if it meets the standard established in section 251(d)(2), which states:

Line Sharing Order ¶ 72.

Petitioners cannot reasonably argue that OSS and other operational support functions will be too difficult for two CLECs to implement. The record is replete with comments filed by CLECs that OSS and other support functions are easy to implement and can be done in a matter of weeks. See e.g., report prepared by Dennis J. Austin of the Maxim Telecom Consulting Group ("MTG") filed with the Commission on September 30, 1999 in CC Docket 98-147.

Line Sharing Order ¶ 72, fn. 160 (emphasis added). See also ¶ 74 (The Commission stated "[w]e agree with both incumbent and competitive LECs that the unbundling obligations should be defined to permit only a single competitor to share the line with the incumbent. The record indicates significant support for two-carrier line sharing arrangements, with an incumbent LEC providing analog, circuit-switched voice service and a competitive LEC providing data service.")(emphasis added).

- (2) ACCESS STANDARDS In determining what network elements should be made available for purposes of subsection (c)(3), the Commission shall consider, at a minimum, whether—
 - (A) access to such network elements as are proprietary in nature is necessary; and
 - (B) the failure to provide access to such network elements would impair the ability of the telecommunications carrier seeking access to provide the services that it seeks to offer.

Applying this standard, the Commission specifically determined that failure to provide access to the high spectrum frequency on a loop would not impair CLECs when the ILEC provided no voice service on that loop.

B. ILECs' Obligations for Line Sharing when a CLEC is the Voice Carrier under UNE-P

Both Petitioners focus attention on two CLECs being able to provide services over a shared loop when one of those CLECs is providing voice service to the customer through a UNE-P. The above discussion leaves no doubt that an ILEC's obligations regarding line sharing are limited to only those loops for which it is the provider of the voice service. This limitation of course applies no matter the reason the ILEC no longer provides the voice service; the limitation applies, in particular, once a CLEC begins providing the voice over a UNE-P. And, to make sure there was no confusion on this issue, the Commission stated "[s]imilarly, incumbent carriers are not required to provide line sharing to requesting carriers that are purchasing a combination of network elements known as the platform [UNE-P]. In that circumstance, the incumbent no longer is the voice provider to the customer." Thus, for the reasons discussed above, ILECs have no obligation to offer line sharing to CLECs that provide voice service over UNE-P. This

Line Sharing Order \P 72.

position needs no clarification. Additionally, the Petitioners offer no reasoning why the Commission should change its position on reconsideration.

C. Voluntary Agreements between CLECs to Share a Loop

Petitioners' dubious request for clarification completely distorts what the Commission actually meant in the *Line Sharing Order* – that two CLECs can enter into voluntary agreements to provide services over a shared loop. In such situations, however, the ILEC is not and should not be a party. Indeed, both Petitioners devote much of their petitions to arguing that CLECs may share a loop. Subject to the ILEC not being forced to be a party to the CLECs agreement or having to provision access to the high frequency spectrum, ¹⁸ BellSouth does not disagree. If it obtains a combination of elements from the ILEC and installs its own splitter and DSLAM, a CLEC is then free to partner with another CLEC, through a voluntary agreement, to provide both voice and data services to a single customer. ¹⁹ Other than providing the network elements to provide the voice service, however, the ILEC should play no role in this transaction.

Petitioners labor to find support for their position that ILECs should not only provide the network elements for voice but should also provide the CLECs access and OSS support to the high frequency portion of the spectrum so that one CLEC can provide the data service. For example, MCI quotes sections from the *Line Sharing Order* to demonstrate that the Commission "intended to permit CLEC-to-CLEC line sharing when the ILEC is not the voice provider to residential and small business customers."²⁰ As discussed above, BellSouth agrees that CLEC-

See discussion at section II.A. supra.

This arrangement would be subject to collocation restrictions recently addressed by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and any subsequent collocation orders the Commission may issue to conform with this opinion and section 251(c)(6). GTE Service Corporation, et al. v. FCC, No. 99-1176, slip op. (D.C. Cir. March 17, 2000).

MCI Petition at 5.

to-CLEC line sharing should be allowed as long as the CLECs do all provisioning and operational support, *i.e.*, the ILEC's role is limited to providing the network elements needed for voice service.

MCI, however, interprets Section 319(h)(3) of the Commission's rules²¹ "only to contemplate that ILECs should not be compelled to line share the high frequency portion of the loop if a CLEC is *already* the voice provider – because the ILEC, in essence, has nothing to share."²² MCI reaches this nonsensical interpretation even though nothing in the *Line Sharing Order* or the cited rule can reasonably be read to support such a construction. Even if one were inclined to entertain MCI's interpretation of the rule, one must ask why the ILEC would have anything more to share when the CLEC is already the voice provider. Both ways two CLECs will be sharing the loop, and in MCI's own words "the ILEC...has nothing to share." Of course, if the ILEC has nothing to share, it should not be a part of any agreement between the two CLECs.

D. AT&T's Request to Force ILECs to Provide ADSL

AT&T argues that in addition to allowing two CLECs to use the same line, similar to line sharing, an ILEC should be forced to provide its ADSL service over a UNE-P over which a CLEC is providing voice service, *i.e.*, the ILEC must continue to provide its ADSL service to a customer even if the ILEC no longer provides the voice service. There is no pro-competitive or public policy reason to require an ILEC to offer a highly competitive service such as ADSL in any particular fashion, *e.g.*, over a CLEC's loop. Indeed, the impetus behind line sharing was the

Section 319(h)(3) states: An incumbent LEC shall only provide a requesting carrier with access to the high frequency portion of the loop if the incumbent LEC is providing, and continues to provide, analog circuit-switched voiceband services on the particular loop for which the requesting carrier seeks access.

MCI Petition at 5 (emphasis in original).

claim that data CLECs could not effectively compete when ILECs provided both voice and data over the same loop. The CLECs claimed that ILECs ability to provide voice and data put CLECs at a competitive disadvantage in offering DSL, a competitive service, because of the cost involved in entering the voice market.²³ When the ILEC no longer offers the voice service, any perceived competitive disadvantage is eliminated. Furthermore, the Commission's determination that data CLECs are impaired by not being able to provide DSL service without voice is meaningless if the Commission adopted AT&T's theory that voice providers are impaired unless ILECs are forced to provide DSL service. If the Commission's initial decision that data CLECs are impaired without voice is correct, plenty of data carriers should be eager to provide their ADSL on AT&T's loops. Indeed, ILECs may find it in their best interest to do so as well, but they should be permitted to make this decision based on market conditions and their own business plans. The Commission should not dictate how ILECs offer their competitive services.

Moreover, BellSouth provides its ADSL services pursuant to a federal tariff that the Commission investigated and found it to be lawful.²⁴ The tariff clearly states that in order for ADSL service to be available the end-user premises must be served by an existing BellSouth voice service. Tariffed services are not subject to section 251 unbundling requirements. Indeed, nothing in the 1996 Act requires ILECs to place its tariffed services on another carrier's

See Line Sharing Order ¶ 56 ("...it is the fact that the incumbent is already providing voice service on a loop that makes the preservation of competitive access to the high frequency portion of that loop so vital. Without line sharing, competitors would face substantial barriers to market entry, such as additional required investment for voiceband equipment and facilities, and the difficulties of competing against an entrenched, market-dominant competitor.")

In the Matter of Bell Atlantic Telephone Cos., Bell Atlantic Tariff No. 1, Bell Atlantic Transmittal No. 1076, et al., CC Docket Nos. 98-168, et al., Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 98-317, released November 30, 1998.

facilities, even if the carrier obtained those facilities from the ILEC. If AT&T wants to challenge BellSouth's tariff it should do so through the proper forum and not by a Petition for Reconsideration/Clarification.

III. The Commission Should Deny Petitioners Claims for Reconsideration

To the extent that Petitioners have labeled their petitions as requests for clarification, the above discussion fully demonstrates that no clarification is needed. The Line Sharing Order needs no elucidation on the points raised in the petitions. In the alternative, the Petitioners request that their claims be treated as issues for reconsideration. The Commission's Line Sharing Order, over seventy-seven pages long, is the product of a proceeding that had over thirty-five parties, including Petitioners, filing comments. During this proceeding, the Commission thoroughly reviewed not only the analysis of the comments and the reply comments, but also numerous ex partes, and then formed its conclusion that an ILEC should be required to provide access to the high frequency portion of the loop, i.e., line sharing, only when the ILEC is providing, and continues to provide, analog circuit-switched voiceband services on that particular loop. Indeed, the Commission specifically found impairment to be absent when the LEC is not providing voice service on the customer's loop. Beyond their farcical interpretations of certain sections of the Line Sharing Order, the Petitioners offer no new insights or information. They certainly offer nothing that should prompt a reconsideration of the conclusions drawn from the earlier deliberative process. For all these reasons, the Commission should deny AT&T's and MCI's requests for reconsideration.

IV. Conclusion

The Commission's Order is clear. As discussed herein, Petitioners' requests for clarification or reconsideration are completely without merit and should be denied. Any other decision would make a mockery of the unmistakable wording of the *Line Sharing Order*.

Respectfully submitted,

BELLSOUTH CORPORATION

By its Attorneys

M. Robert Sutherland Stephen L. Earnest

Suite 1700 1155 Peachtree Street, N. E. Atlanta, Georgia 30306-3610 (404) 249-2608

Date: March 22, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that I have this 22nd day of March, 2000, served the following parties to this action with a copy of the foregoing *BELLSOUTH'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS*FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION, reference CC Docket No. 98-147 and CC Docket No. 96-98, by hand delivery or by placing a true and correct copy of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the parties listed below:

Magalie Roman Salas, Commission Secretary*
Federal Communications Commission
Portals II
445 12th Street, SW
TW B-204
Washington, DC 20554

International Transcription Service*
1231 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

NRTA
Margot Smiley Humphrey
Koteen & Naftalin, LLP
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 100
Washington, DC 20036

NTCA
L. Marie Guillory
Daniel Mitchell
4121 Wilson Boulevard
10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1801

Richard S. Whitt Cristin L. Flynn 1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20006 Attorneys for MCI Worldcom, Inc.

Donna M. Epps
Michael E. Glover, Of Counsel
Bell Atlantic
1320 North Courthouse Road
Eighth Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

Mark C. Rosenblum
Stephen C. Caravito
Richard H. Rubin
AT&T Corp
Room 1131M1
295 N. Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

James L. Casserly
Michael H. Pryor
James J. Valentino
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris
Glovsky & Popeo, PC
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

* VIA HAND DELIVERY

Certificate of Service Cc Docket No. 98-147, CC Docket No. 96-98 FCC Filing 3/22/00 Doc. No. 115981 v4